UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,144	02/17/2004	Aaron Sauve	14917.1241US01/307917.01	2246

27488 7590 11/10/2009

MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER	
KIM, JUNG W	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2432	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/10/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,144	SAUVE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JUNG KIM	2432	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 July 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26,28,29,31,33,36-56 and 58-66* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26,28,29,31,33,36-56 and 58-66* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is in response to the amendment filed on 7/9/09.

2. Claims 1-26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 36-56 and 58-66 are pending.

Response to Amendment

3. The 112 rejections to the claims are withdrawn in view of the amended claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claims are moot in view of the new rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1-4, 9, 10, 16, 17, 20, 36-41, 44, 45, 51, 52, 55, 56, 58-63, 65 and 66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent et al. US 6,366,912 (hereinafter Wallent) in view of Touboul US 6,154,844 (hereinafter Touboul '844).

6. As per claim 1, Wallent discloses a method of displaying a web page by a browser at a client device, comprising:

a. detecting, by the browser at the client device, an object associated with a web page (col. 11:18-37, browser receives a web page, and a determination is made of a protected operation);

b. according, by the browser at the client device, as part of displaying the web page, one or more of a plural of trust level security settings of the browser to the web page including the object, wherein the according comprises evaluating a content, source, or action of the web page (2:55-60, security zones are established, each zone is associated with a set of web sites; 7:8-59, internet security manager and security configuration UI, window enables user to configure security settings based on a trust level);

c. suppressing the object based on the one or more of the plurality of trust level security settings of the browser that are accorded to the objects (8:52-9:62, security settings can be adjusted to suppress untrusted downloadables, such as ActiveX controls).

7. Wallent does not disclose according a trust level to the object, wherein the according comprises evaluating a content, source or action of the object. However, at the time of Applicant's invention, it was known to assign a security profile to a downloadable embedded within a webpage and to suppress the downloadable depending on the security profile of the downloadable. For example, Touboul '844 discloses a system and method for associating a downloadable security profile to a downloadable (col. 5:28-32), whereby the browser compares the downloadable security profile against the local security policies (5:32-33). The local security policy may include rules that suppress the downloadable depending on the downloadable security profile (8:6-16). These rules consider, inter alia, the specific downloadable and trusted certificates associated with the downloadable. Id. Therefore, it would be obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the invention of Wallent to accord a trust level to the object, wherein the according comprises evaluating a content, source or action of the object. One would be motivated to do so to provide fine grain protection against known hostile downloadables. See Touboul '844, col. 2:61-63. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 1.

8. As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. In addition, the object is one of a COM object or an ActiveX control. (Wallent, col. 8:52-9:62; Touboul '844, 1:62-65)

9. As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. In addition, the object is embedded in the web page, and includes any one of downloadable code, a link to a URL, a popup window, graphic data, a video file, an audio file, and a text file. (Wallent, col. 8:52-9:62, ActiveX embedded in a webpage; Touboul '844, col. 1:62-65)

10. As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. Neither Wallent nor Touboul '844 explicitly disclose the object is a link to an object on a remote server. However, it is notoriously well known for objects to be incorporated into an html web page as a link to an object on a remote server. For example, the HTML

specification defines an object tag to incorporate a remote object into a web page via a URI attribute to indicate the location of the object. This feature enables, inter alia, logical and physical separation of the parts of a web page, which allows efficient uploading of the portions of the web page specific to the type of information. Official notice of this teaching is taken. Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the object to be a link to an object on a remote server. One would be motivated to do so to implement good design fundamentals into the invention, including scalability and separation of concerns. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 4.

11. As per claims 9 and 10, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. Wallent further discloses suppressing the object includes displaying a modal prompt to provide a user with an activation choice to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria. Col. 8:56-10:10 and fig. 5. Touboul '944 further discloses wherein according the one or more of the plurality of trust level security settings of the browser to the object evaluates criteria including whether the object is to be rendered and whether a download flag is set. (col. 7:49-8:16; 10:14-24) One would be motivated to modify the invention of Wallent with the invention of Touboul '844 in order to provide fine grain protection against known hostile downloadables. See Touboul '844, col. 2:61-63. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 9 and 10.

12. As per claims 16, 17 and 20, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. Wallent further discloses suppressing the object includes displaying a modal prompt to provide a user with an activation choice to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria, and the modal prompt describing the content of the suppressed object. Col. 8:56-10:10 and fig. 5. Touboul '844 further discloses the step of assessing which of the plural trust levels is to be accorded to the object evaluates criteria including whether the object is beneath a security setting and whether a security setting flag is set (col. 7:49-51; 8:6-16). One would be motivated to modify the invention of Wallent with the invention of Touboul '844 in order to provide fine grain protection against known hostile downloadables. See Touboul '844, col. 2:61-63. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 16, 17 and 20.

13. As per claims 36-41, 44, 45, 51, 52 and 55, they are apparatus claims corresponding to claims 1-4, 9, 10, 16, 17 and 20, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 1-4, 9, 10, 16, 17 and 20. Therefore, claims 36-41, 44, 45, 51, 52 and 55 are rejected as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 16, 17 and 20.

14. As per claims 56, 58-63, 65 and 66, they are apparatus claims corresponding to claims 1-4, 9, 10, 16, 17, 20, 36-41, 44, 45, 51, 52 and 55, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 11-4, 9, 10, 16, 17, 20, 36-41, 44, 45, 51, 52 and 55. Therefore, claims 56, 58-63, 65 and 66 are rejected as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 16, 17, 20, 36-41, 44, 45, 51, 52 and 55.

15. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Donohue USPN 6,202,207 (hereinafter Donohue).

16. As per claims 5 and 6, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. Wallent further discloses suppressing the object includes displaying a modal prompt to provide a user with an activation choice to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria. Col. 8:56-10:10 and fig. 5. Touboul '944 further discloses wherein according the one or more of the plurality of trust level security settings of the browser to the object evaluates criteria, as party of displaying the web page, including whether the object is from a trusted source and whether a download flag is set. (col. 7:49-53; 10:14-24) However, neither Wallent nor Touboul '844 disclose the criteria includes whether the object is to upgrade an existing object. Donohue discloses a method for updating software, including accessing a web site to download resources to update versions of a software, downloading the resources, verifying the resources

and building the updated version, wherein verification step includes verifying the signature of the downloaded resource, verifying allowable growth paths from the current to the updated versions based on license restrictions, and verifying other authentication information including password and/or a database usage parameter value. Col. 10:16-12:48. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the criteria to include whether the object is to upgrade an existing object, since this ensures that only trusted resources are used to upgrade an existing object. Donohue, 10:50-58. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 5 and 6.

17. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 and Donohue, and further in view of Pennell et al. US Patent Application Publication No. 20030098883. (hereinafter Pennell)

18. As per claim 8, the rejection of claim 5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 and Donohue is incorporated herein. Moreover, None of Wallent, Touboul '844 nor Donohue disclose wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. Pennell discloses a method for blocking "bad" windows and displaying "good" windows, wherein a window analyzer identifies whether a window is "good" or "bad" based on a list having characteristics of the window, including the source of the window (paragraph 0043), and wherein when a "bad" window is identified, blocking the window and displaying a prompt to indicate the

suppression of the window based on this identification. (paragraph 0081) Pennell further discloses the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and provides the user with a subsequent activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th, 6th sentence) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of suppressing the object to include displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon the positive evaluation of any of the criteria; wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. One would be motivated to do so for a user-friendly manner of informing the user of a preventive measure by the invention. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 8.

19. As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 8 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Donohue and Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) Furthermore, it is notoriously well known in the art to provide a description of an action to the user with a modeless prompt. Examples abound: modeless prompts describing status and actions have been a part of GUI-based OS systems from their inception. The basic rational for providing a description with a modeless prompt is that it informs the user 1) an action was taken and 2) what the action was. Furthermore, a modeless prompt that is displayed when an object is suppressed without any description of the object being suppressed is analogous to an alert of a situation without any description of the situation; in both scenarios, a message that identified what has

occurred enables the receiver of the prompt or alert to properly react to the prompt or alert. Official Notice of this teaching is taken. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the modeless prompt to provide a description of the object being suppressed. One would be motivated to do so to provide the user with a more user-friendly experience as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 7.

20. Claims 11-15, 18, 19, 21-26, 28, 29, 31, 33, 42, 43, 46-50, 53, 54 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 and Pennell.

21. As per claims 11 and 12, the rejection of claim 9 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. Moreover, neither Wallent nor Touboul '844 disclose wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. Pennell discloses a method for blocking "bad" windows and displaying "good" windows, wherein a window analyzer identifies whether a window is "good" or "bad" based on a list having characteristics of the window, including the source of the window (paragraph 0043), and wherein when a "bad" window is identified, blocking the window and displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the window based on this identification. (paragraph 0081) Pennell further discloses the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the

user with a subsequent activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th, 6th sentence) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of suppressing the object to include displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon the positive evaluation of any of the criteria; wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. One would be motivated to do so for a user-friendly manner of informing the user of a preventive measure by the invention. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 11 and 12.

22. As per claim 13, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. Neither Wallent nor Touboul '844 disclose the step of according the one or more of the plurality of trust level security settings of the browser to the object is based on whether the object is a popup window, and the step of suppressing the object includes displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive determination. Pennell discloses it is desirous to block certain popup windows to prevent annoyances to a user browsing experience and discloses a method for blocking "bad" popup windows and displaying "good" popup windows, wherein a window analyzer identifies whether a window is "good" or "bad" based on a list having characteristics of the window, including the source of the window (paragraphs 0006-0008 and 0043), and wherein when a "bad" window is identified, blocking the window and displaying a prompt

to indicate the suppression of the window based upon a positive determination. (paragraph 0081) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of according the one or more of the plurality of trust level security settings of the browser to the object is based on whether the object is a popup window, and the step of suppressing the object includes displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive determination. One would be motivated to do so to block unwanted popups from cluttering the screen and for generating a user-friendly manner of informing the user of a preventive measure by the invention. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 13.

23. As per claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 and Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th sentence)

24. As per claim 15, the rejection of claim 13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Touboul '844 in view of Pennell is incorporated herein. (supra) In addition, the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with an activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th and 6th sentence)

25. As per claims 18 and 19, the rejection of claim 16 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 is incorporated herein. Moreover, neither Wallent nor Touboul '844 disclose wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. Pennell discloses a method for blocking "bad" windows and displaying "good" windows, wherein a window analyzer identifies whether a window is "good" or "bad" based on a list having characteristics of the window, including the source of the window (paragraph 0043), and wherein when a "bad" window is identified, blocking the window and displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the window based on this identification. (paragraph 0081) Pennell further discloses the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th, 6th sentence) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of suppressing the object to include displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon the positive evaluation of any of the criteria; wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. One would be motivated to do so for a user-friendly manner of informing the user of a preventive measure by the invention. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 18 and 19.

26. As per claims 21-26, 28, 29 and 33, the rejections of claims 1-4, 9, 10, 16, 17 and 20 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 are incorporated herein. Touboul '844 further discloses a computer-readable storage medium having one or more instructions that, when read, cause one or more processors on a client device to execute steps as recited in claims 1-4. (col. 5:34-46) Moreover, neither Wallent nor Touboul '844 disclose wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. Pennell discloses a method for blocking "bad" windows and displaying "good" windows, wherein a window analyzer identifies whether a window is "good" or "bad" based on a list having characteristics of the window, including the source of the window (paragraph 0043), and wherein when a "bad" window is identified, blocking the window and displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the window based on this identification. (paragraph 0081) Pennell further discloses the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. (Pennell, paragraph 0081, 5th, 6th sentence) It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the step of suppressing the object to include displaying a prompt to indicate the suppression of the object based upon the positive evaluation of any of the criteria; wherein the prompt is a modeless prompt to advise a user of the object being suppressed and to provide the user with a subsequent activation choice. One would be motivated to do so for a user-friendly manner of informing the user of a preventive measure by the invention.

27. Furthermore, it is notoriously well known in the art to provide a description of an action to the user with a modeless prompt. Examples abound: modeless prompts describing status and actions have been a part of GUI-based OS systems from their inception. The basic rational for providing a description with a modeless prompt is that it informs the user 1) an action was taken and 2) what the action was. Furthermore, a modeless prompt that is displayed when an object is suppressed without any description of the object being suppressed is analogous to an alert of a situation without any description of the situation; in both scenarios, a message that identified what has occurred enables the receiver of the prompt or alert to properly react to the prompt or alert. Official Notice of this teaching is taken. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the modeless prompt to provide a description of the object being suppressed. One would be motivated to do so to provide the user with a more user-friendly experience as known to one of ordinary skill in the art. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claims 21-26, 28, 29 and 33.

28. As per claim 31, the rejection of claim 21 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 and Pennell is incorporated herein. Wallent further discloses suppressing the object includes displaying a modal prompt to provide a user with an activation choice to indicate the suppression of the object based upon a positive evaluation of any of the criteria, and the modal prompt describing the content of the suppressed object. Col. 8:56-10:10 and fig. 5. Touboul '844 further discloses the step of assessing which of the plural trust levels is to be accorded to the

object evaluates criteria including whether the object is beneath a security setting and whether a security setting flag is set (col. 7:49-51; 8:6-16). One would be motivated to modify the invention of Wallent with the invention of Touboul '844 in order to provide fine grain protection against known hostile downloadables. See Touboul '844, col. 2:61-63. The aforementioned cover the limitations of claim 31.

29. As per claims 42, 43, 46-50, 53 and 54, they are apparatus claims corresponding to claims 11-15, 18, 19, 21-26, 28, 29, 31 and 33, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 11-15, 18, 19, 21-26, 28, 29 and 33. Therefore, claims 42, 43, 46-50, 53 and 54 are rejected as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 and Pennell for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 11-15, 18, 19, 21-26, 28, 29, 31 and 33.

30. As per claim 64, it is an apparatus claim corresponding to claims 11-15, 18, 19, 21-26, 28, 29, 33, 42, 43, 46-50, 53 and 54, and they do not teach or define above the information claimed in claims 11-15, 18, 19, 21-26, 28, 29, 33, 42, 43, 46-50, 53 and 54. Therefore, claim 64 is rejected as being unpatentable over Wallent in view of Touboul '844 and Pennell for the same reasons set forth in the rejections of claims 11-15, 18, 19, 21-26, 28, 29, 33, 42, 43, 46-50, 53 and 54.

Conclusion

31. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Communications Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JUNG KIM whose telephone number is (571)272-3804. The examiner can normally be reached on FLEX.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gilberto Barron can be reached on 571-272-3799. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Jung Kim/
Primary Examiner, AU 2432